

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

590 W. El Camino Real, Mountain View, CA 94040
Telephone: (650) 961-8300 Facsimile: (650) 961-8301
www.beyerlaw.com

JUL 21 2005

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

July 21, 2005

Receiver: Shawn S. An, Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2613

TEL #: (571) 272-7324

FAX # : (571) 273-8300

Sender: William J. Plut, Lim. Rec. Reg. No. L0079

Our Ref. No.: CISCP158/3179

Re: RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/766,020

Filed: January 18, 2001

Title: "Methods for Efficient Bandwidth Scaling of Compressed Video Data"

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): 9

MESSAGE:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: ZHANG et al.

Attorney Docket No.: CISCP158/3179

Application No.: 09/766,020

Examiner: AN, Shawn S.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Filed: January 18, 2001

Group: 2613

JUL 21 2005


Title: METHODS FOR EFFICIENT
BANDWIDTH SCALING OF COMPRESSED
VIDEO DATA

Confirmation No.: 8083

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to fax number 571-273-8300 to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 21, 2005.

Signed:


Sue Punchess**RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This amendment is submitted in response to the Communication mailed June 30, 2005 in which the response required by 37 CFR 1.121 was deemed incomplete because the text of claims 16-25 was not included. Claims 16-25 were withdrawn from prosecution in response to the Restriction Requirement dated February 12, 2004. The claims are included in the response and it is believed that this revised response addresses this issue. As such, it should be treated as a complete response to the outstanding office action as required by 37 CFR 1.114 and 37 CFR 1.111.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which being on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 7 of this paper.